

---

ITEM	APP/2007/6407	WARD Rock Ferry
------	---------------	-----------------

---

**Location:** Silverdale Residential Home 49-51 Egerton Park Rock Ferry Wirral CH42 4RA

**Proposal:** Erection of three storey side, single storey front and rear extensions to provide 17no. additional bedrooms with associated dayspace and improved laundry and kitchen provision (amended description)

**Applicant:** Silverdale Care Home Ltd  
c/o Norwich Healthcare Ltd  
Marble Arch Tower  
55 Bryanston Street  
London  
W1H 7AJ

**Agent:** DWA Architects Ltd  
39 Blossom Street  
York  
YO24 1AQ

**Development Plan allocation and policies:** Primarily Residential Area  
Policy HS8 Nursing homes/residential care homes  
Policy HS4 Criteria for new housing development

**Planning History:** 19986467 erection of a three storey side extension, single storey side, rear extension and conservatory to front, approved conditionally.

**Representations and consultations received:** Representations:  
A site notice was displayed on a tree to the front boundary. A total of 41 letters of notification have been sent to properties in the area. At the time of writing this report 4 letters of objection have been received and two petitions, one qualifying petition with 35 separate households, listing the following grounds:

- Impact onto privacy
- Loss of light
- Waste water
- Pressure on sewer system
- Tree preservation order
- Traffic increase
- Aesthetics
- Noise pollution
- Condition of road surface
- Street scene

Egerton Park Residents Ltd: Objections raised on the following grounds; Increased traffic and safety concerns due to the unsuitable road surface, the access does not have adequate sight lines. The alterations would increase risk to the sewerage and drain system, the proposed extensions do not match the design and character of the area.

Consultations:

Director of Regeneration - Housing & Environmental Protection Division: No objection  
Director of Technical Services - Traffic Management Division: Recommend refusal on the following grounds; any additional development proposed within Egerton Park will require improvement to the junction of Bebington Road and Egerton Park, in order to provide a minimum carriageway width of 5m to allow safe manoeuvres into and out of the junction. Therefore until this is achieved it is recommended that the application be refused on highway safety grounds.

Director of Corporate Services - Access Officer: No objection

**Directors comments:** PROPOSAL  
The proposal is for the erection of two, three-storey side extensions with a single storey front and rear extension to provide 17no additional bedrooms with associated day space and improved laundry and kitchen provision.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The property is located with Egerton Park; the access point into Egerton Park from Bebington Road is not sufficient to withstand any additional increase in vehicle movement due to its width. The proposal to increase the number of residents within Egerton Park will result in an increase in traffic to and from Egerton Park; the proposal

would therefore be unacceptable due to highway safety.

#### SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The existing building consists of two properties converted into one residential care home. The site has a number of mature trees and shrubbery. The building is three-storey in height, as are most of the immediate neighbouring residential properties.

#### POLICY CONTEXT

Policy HS8 states that extensions to care homes will be acceptable if the proposal is in scale with the neighbouring properties and relates well to the surrounding area. The proposed extensions match in terms of height however the design of the extensions do not complement the style of the property, the layout of the plot is triangular so the rear elevation of the three-storey extensions are within close proximity to the neighbouring residential dwellings, however due to the proposal increasing the number of residents by 17, the impact onto the highway would cause harm to Egerton Park in terms of highway safety.

#### APPEARANCE AND AMENITY ISSUES

The proposed extensions are dominant in terms of their relationship with the original building; the proposal does not create a fluid extension. The details of the proposed extension roof do not match that in the existing building nor does the window alignment. In terms of the existing building and its design features, the proposed extension add a concept that does not enhance or support the design of the original building and has an overly institutional appearance. The proposed design does not complement, but swamps the host building.

Objections are raised on the grounds of existing road condition and safety in terms of the state of the current highway. The relevant objections raised by the neighbouring properties are in terms of loss of light and impact onto privacy. The extension would introduce two three-storey side extensions within close proximity to residential elevations and gardens.

In terms of the concerns raised with drainage and sewerage, this cannot be determined as part of the planning permission.

#### HIGHWAY/TRAFFIC IMPLICATIONS

The proposal would cause an increase in harm in terms of highway safety; the proposal is located within Egerton Park where the access point is not substantial enough to sustain any increase in traffic.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL/SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

There are no Environmental/Sustainability issues relating to these proposals.

#### HEALTH ISSUES

There are no health implications relating to this application.

#### CONCLUSION

The proposal would create a harmful impact onto the existing dangerous highway access point. The proposal is therefore unacceptable in terms of highway safety.

**Recommendation: Refuse**

**Reason(s):**

- 1 The existing vehicular access to Egerton Park from Bebington Road is considered to be inadequate due to its limited width to accommodate further development that would result in additional vehicular movements. It is considered that any increase in traffic within this highway would decrease highway safety.
- 2 The proposed three storey side extension do not compliment or match the design of the existing building, due to their size and prominence to the frontage of the building and the street scene, the extensions would have a detrimental impact in terms of design. The proposal is unacceptable in terms of design and would be contrary to Policy HS8 and HS4 of the adopted Wirral UDP and Policy DP3 of the Regional Spatial Strategy.

**Planning Committee 13 September 2007**

---

**Last Comments By: 09 August 2007**

**56 Day Expires On: 27 August 2007**